associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the hon. Members. Sir, this is a very serious problem and it has affected many parts of our country, particularly, the North-East and Andhra Pradesh. Many innocent people have been killed. Many explosions have taken place. Recently, as has been explained by the hon. Member, an explosion took place in Andhra Pradesh, and Madhav Reddyji was targeted by the PWG. They have killed him brutally. Our dynamic Chief Minister has taken many preventive measures to control this menace. What 1 am requesting the Central Government is that it should provide more and more financial help to States such as Andhra Pradesh. Recently, the Centre has provided funds to Punjab, Assam and Kashmir, which are all affected by this sort of extremism. I would like to submit that it is not the problem of one State; it is the problem of the country. The whole country is facing this kind of a problem. I am not reacting to this on political basis. I am not saying that the Government in inefficient. I personally request that the Centre should react to this immediately. Thank you.

DR. Y. RADHAKRISHNA MURTY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I would like to associate myself with the Special Mention raised by Mr. Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy and the sentiments expressed by other hon. Members.

Visit by U.S. President

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Goa): It was in 1977 that I had the privilege of coming to Parliament as a young Member... *(Interruptions)*.. .One thing I would like to say is, the B.J.P, is lucky to have such a good spokesman. He put things so well and in such a moderate and articulate manner.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): You are supposed to speak on Mr. Clinton's visit not on Mr. Venkaiah Naidu!

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: It was in 1977 - or there abouts - we had the pleasure of the visit of President Carter. Well, it was an important visit. Now, this visit is also important, if not more than that. Between then and now, the United States is the sole super power. Therefore, this deserves a lot of attention. Whether it is the super power or not, the United States of America is a country. This is a visit in the context of the American Foreign Policy. And foreign policy is all about national interest and advancing the national interest. Any foreign policy begins with national interest and ends

with the national interest. Therefore, the U.S.A. is coming here, through President Clinton, to advance the American national interest. My plea here is, we must welcome him, and we will welcome him, since he is such an important Head of State, but, at the same time, we must look after our own national interests and see that they are advanced through this visit. What are America's national interests? What interests have they always had? The first and the foremost is the economic interest. Well, economic interests are important for every country and, perhaps, even more than for the United States. My plea here is, while receiving him, let us receive him with our head held high, advance our own concerns and solve them, but do not buckle down. This is really a matter of concern. I say this because of some signs which are really not very good. In January, we had an announcement from Washington - not from Delhi - about the removal of quantitative restrictions on American imports. This is a thing, which, to begin with, has tremendous implications. I am told here to keep this on a low key. But the implications of this removal of quantitative restrictions are horrific, to say the least. Look at the items which are now going to be brought in here. Some items are brought in with zero duty. You will see why do I say this is horrific. The question is, we had agreed with the European Union and other countries to remove these restrictions by the year 2003. How it had happened with the United States? We mismanage things with the United States so badly to the great detriment of the country. Now, this is thickly - not thinly - veiled statement, which is at page 99 of the Economic Survey presented to the House just a few days ago, it is said, "we are now going to remove these restrictions by initiative from the United States on the eve of the President Clinton's visit beginning from 20th March, 2000." The first thing is, why was Parliament not taken into confidence? Why was the agreement entered into in December and not disclosed to this Parliament! It was announced in January when Parliament was not in Session; in Washington. Not a word here on this removal which has, as I said, horrific implications to our economy, including agriculture.

I am talking about agriculture. The United States would like to advance its interests in this largest market in the world, the largest consumer market in the world after the United States itself. We have at least about 300 to 400 million people in this country with a purchasing power which will interest the Americans very much. I want to plead with the Government that we must stand by economic self-reliance.' I am just making general points

here. By economic self-reliance, I mean, we should not be subject again to colonialism and imperialism in a worst form, that is, economic colonialism and economic imperialism. I am pleading to draw the attention of the Government, particularly, to the agricultural sector. What about the agricultural sector? America has the largest agro business in the world -multi-national agro business, with names like Cargill. Cargill is the largest agro business in the world. Cargill, all the same, controls more than 70 per cent of the world trade in foodgrains and other agricultural products. It operates in more than hundred countries. This is just an example. We have Monsanto. What have these agro business multinationals done in United States itself? They have destroyed the family farms. Hardly any farmers are left on small farms in the United States. It may be fine for the United States because they are in the post-industrial era. But what about India? Where are we? What is going to happen to our farms if agro business of gigantic dimensions take over? That is why I want to draw the attention of the Government to protect our fanners, to protect our economy, to protect our industry and see that our interests are advanced, and that we do not suffer grievous loss in our economy, in this manner. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): You have to conclude. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am going to conclude, Sir. This is a very important matter. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM):The debate is over the visit by American President. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Pardon, Sir?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): The topic you have given is on the visit by the American President. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Of course; not where he is going to stay, Sir. Not where he is going to have his food. It is on what he is going to discuss. It is on the agenda. Now, we are talking about the economics of it. In order to support their economic super power, status, they must be a military super power which means they must control, among other things, nuclear weapons around the world. I am not going to speak about the CTBT because the Government is negotiating and discussing with other political parties. But I may re-state and remind this House of what Parliament had

unanimously agreed upon that arms control measures must be linked to a Nuclear Global Disarmament Policy. This has been the unanimous decision of this House. The Nuclear Disarmament Policy must be complete, must be global, and must not be unequal.

I have a last point to make on Mr. Clinton's statement that Kashmir is the most explosive place in the world. I am unable to comment on it because I am not a security expert. But, I must say this that steps taken by this Government from Pokhran II to Kargil and others have only helped to internationalise the Kashmir issue. So, I would say to the Government that their policy on Kashmir has failed. Militancy in Kashmir has never been as much as it is today. Alienation of the people of Kashmir has never been as great. Therefore, the time has come to reconsider our policy towards Kashmir, keeping the Kashmiri people at the centre of our Kashmir policy. Kashmir is not a piece of real estate to be bargained among different countries. Kashmir belongs to the people of Kashmir. Naturally, therefore, it is necessary to impress upon the people of Kashmir that they are like us, in order to remove the sense of alienation, to give them genuine democracy and to, see... *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM): Please conclude.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am concluding, Sir. *(Interruptions)* This is a very important subject. *(Interruptions)* .....to see that they get a competent and corruption-free Government, and to make them feel that their interests lie with this country and with the people of this country. We must overcome together. Therefore, I would request the Minister that we should have a discussion on this. It was agreed that we would have a discussion on Foreign Policy in the first part of the Session. May I request the hon. Minister to comment?

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल)**:** उपसभाध्यक्ष जी ....

उपसभाध्यक्ष (**श्री मोहम्मद सलीम**): कोई भाषण नहीं।

श्रीमती सरला माहेश्वरी: उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, सरकार जिस तरह से झुक रही है, वह बहुत ही गलत है। संसद को बिना विश्वास में लिए तमाम आयात प्रतिबंधो को हटा देना बहुत ही गलत बात है।

SHRI KHAGEN DAS (Tripura): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir,

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI MD. SALIM) : Just a minute. The Leader of the House wants to react.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI JASWANT SINGH) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have been invited by the hon. Member to react to what he has said under the Special Mention on the projected visit of President Clinton. The hon. Member has chosen to bring in largely three issues. One is W.T.O.-related issues and quantitative restriction, focussing particularly on agricultural produce and the importance of it. He started by saying that only national interests should determine the policy. Sir, let me tell the hon. Members that please be rest assured that national interest is the only criteria. There is no doubt about it. On the lifting of quantitative restrictions of the W.T.O., and that this was done under any kind of pressure, please let me disabuse the hon. Member's apprehension that there is no such thing, and it is not U.S. specific. The quantitative restriction is an obligation of the W.T.O, related things. So far as the agricultural produce is concerned, as the hon. Member, no doubt knows, and as Seattle has proven, th; question of India's disagreement on agricultural produce is precisely one of the factors that let the systems overload at Seattle, and what Seattle subsequently became.

On the question of Test Ban Treaty, let me again re-affirm what I have said in this House, and in the other House, that the position of the Government is specific and unambiguous. We are engaged in the process of consensus-building in this regard, and as to whether India will act under pressure or buckle under pressure is somewhat an unfair observation, considering the fact that after all, it is this Government which did conduct the tests, and if buckling under pressure was the criterian, these tests would not have been conducted at all. On the third aspect related to President Clinton's visit, he started by saying that statements have been issued reportedly by President Clinton about the Line of Control, and on the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir being a dangerous area. That is a perception that they hold. We do not share that perception. We have a very different perception. Also the other aspect of the general situation within the Indian State of Jammu & Kashmir, that is altogether a different subject.

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal) : Sir, there is a serious apprehension about it all over the country and that should be kept in mind.